

## New York Tribune.

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

SATURDAY, JULY 10, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, Charles M. Hall, President; G. Verner Rogers, Secretary and Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, No. 124 Nassau Street, New York.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.**  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$12.00; 6 months, \$7.00; 3 months, \$4.00.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$12.00; 6 months, \$7.00; 3 months, \$4.00.  
Sunday only, 1 year, \$6.00; 6 months, \$3.50; 3 months, \$2.00.

**FOREIGN RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.**  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$9.00; 3 months, \$5.00.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$9.00; 3 months, \$5.00.  
Sunday only, 1 year, \$8.00; 6 months, \$4.50; 3 months, \$2.50.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

## The United States and Germany.

In dealing with the note which the imperial German Government is sending to Washington there is precisely one point that the people of this country must at all times keep in mind. No nation can consent or assent to the murder of its citizens; to do this is to relinquish one of the prime purposes of national association.

The questions that are to be settled between Germany and ourselves are difficult, but not insoluble. A method of separation of ammunition cargoes and American passengers can be found. A majority of the American people seem plainly willing that certain American rights should be waived, that American citizens may not be used as the screen for the transport of ammunition intended to destroy German soldiers.

But such an agreement cannot be made so long as Germany declines to face the Lusitania fact. The American citizens on that British ship were travelling under the protection of international law and under the express guarantee of the President of the United States as contained in his message to the German Government on its submarine blockade. In declaring that the German Government would be held to strict accountability for any infraction of American rights the President frankly invited American citizens to take ship, as the passengers of the Lusitania did.

Now it remains for Germany to deal with our demand for a settlement in the Lusitania case. This is not impossible. Already she has suggested that her information led her to believe that the ship was armed. We have informed her that our official records disclose the fact that her information was wrong. But if she proceeded on mistaken information she can now concede this, accept the proper responsibility and agree to the recognition of rights invaded by her act. She can explain that she acted on a mistaken impression, but point out that had her impression been correct her action would have been warranted.

What this country cannot endure is that Germany should ignore the Lusitania incident and seek to traffic in our rights on the basis that her necessities permit her to commit murder and disregard law whenever she chooses. We may not fight for our dead, but we cannot abandon them. We may be willing to negotiate, but we cannot consent to surrender our rights at the pistol's point.

No question of ammunition, of property, of material interest is of moment here. On this issue the United States stands forth as the champion not alone of its own citizens, but of international law and humane practice for the whole world. If international law can be neglected at the pleasure of one nation, it will be neglected by all, and we shall go back to essential barbarism. If a nation can resort to murder, kill not enemies but neutrals whenever it pleases and compel the country whose neutrals have been murdered to assent to their assassination, we are back in the Dark Ages.

Our dead, who have been scattered over the seas, our women and children who were the victims of German aggression, were covered by the protection of American nationality and the guarantee of their flag. They are dead. But we cannot become accomplices to their murder by permitting the nation which murdered them to decline all discussion of the crime, all responsibility for the assault upon our rights.

If the United States to-day abandons the case of its murdered citizens it will be dishonored; but, even worse, the whole world will suffer through the successful assertion of the doctrine that law, humanity, all that civilization means, can be abolished with perfect impunity by any nation at war and ready to seek victory in any pathways. We shall consent to the doctrine that might is right, and we shall consent to it in the face of the fact that our own citizens have been slain to establish it.

Let us think clearly about all this. Let us see clearly that there is in this no question of arms or ammunition—no question of assisting one belligerent at the expense of another. We are in the presence of something more vital than property rights, something more sacred than the selfish interests of one nation. All civilization falls if it be asserted successfully by one nation that there are no rights, no conventions, no humanities, when self-interest is at stake.

More than a century ago we answered the Barbary pirates, seeking a similar

bargain, in words that remain memorable. "Millions for defence, but not one cent for tribute," was the assertion of a principle that remains. We can deal with Germany, discuss a *modus vivendi*, consent to the waiving of certain rights, even put an embargo upon the export of arms, if this seems wise to the President and Congress. But we can do nothing under compulsion, nor in any fashion agree to surrender rights under compulsion.

We do not want to make war to avenge the dead of the Lusitania. But since our government sent them to their death it cannot abandon them now. It cannot become the accessory after the fact of their murder. It cannot bargain with Germany while Germany asserts her right to murder Americans. It cannot do this primarily because to do this would be to betray our dead, abandon the rights of the living, surrender the most essential fact in independent national existence. Above and beyond all these, it cannot do this because to do so would be to assent to the destruction of the whole structure of international law and a return to the conditions of sheer savagery.

The situation is a difficult one, but it is not of our making. The solution is hard to find, but no anxiety to avoid war, no desire for peace, can justify our abandoning our dead and subscribing to the doctrine that one nation's need warrants the invasion of all nations' rights, those of neutrals as well as of belligerents.

All Americans must remember that the beginning of the discussion of German-American differences must be the discussion of the Lusitania affair, and the first step in the direction of an arrangement and accommodation of dangerous and disturbing problems affecting American rights and German interests must be the recognition of American rights. Precisely as long as Germany asserts the right to murder, Americans must stand on all their rights. To do less is to betray not our own living and dead but civilization itself.

## No Luxuries in the Courthouse.

Just why the taxpayers of this city should furnish an extensive "lounge" or clubroom, with or without a bar, for the lawyers in the proposed new courthouse is a problem to tax the wits of any person not a lawyer. Just why there should be four dining rooms, or restaurants, in the building is another problem of equal difficulty.

Mayor Mitchel and Mr. McAneny are right in having the plans scrutinized rigorously for such extravagances. There is need for a courthouse, but there is no earthly need for building a gilded palace of luxury instead of a business building with proper appointments and ordinary comforts. New York City just at present is poor, and it is likely to be poorer before it is richer, the way state taxes are being thrust upon us. It is an excellent time to lop off superfluities from municipal undertakings.

## The La Follette Law Fiasco.

The administration is finding the La Follette law even more of a white elephant than the discriminating duty section of the Underwood tariff act. Both these measures ripped up our treaties of commerce and navigation with foreign countries. The Treasury Department tried to get around the provision for a rebate on duties on goods imported in American bottoms by simply declining to enforce it. The Federal Commerce Court has recently held that Pickwickian manoeuvre to be illegal, deciding that, as the law stands, a rebate must be given not only to American ships but to the ships of nearly all the other maritime nations.

Similarly the solicitor of the Department of Commerce is trying to minimize the senseless meddling of the La Follette law by saying that its inspection sections do not apply to the ships of Germany, Great Britain, France, Japan, Norway, Denmark, Canada, New South Wales and New Zealand. They do apply to the ships of Italy, Russia and Greece. As a consequence conditions remain exactly what they were for the great majority of the maritime nations, while the burdens of the new inspection system fall as an additional handicap on American shipping, besides getting us into profitless friction with Greece, Russia and Italy.

The solicitor has also ruled that the lifesaving provisions of the law apply to American vessels exclusively, thus creating another discrimination against American operators. The only part of the law which, in his opinion, upsets treaty relations with all other countries is that which attempts to compel foreign masters to conform to an American standard of wage contracts.

This effort is wholly destructive of the principle of reciprocal rights on which treaties of commerce are based. If we are going to dictate what shall be the relationship as to wage contracts between a foreign shipmaster and his men, any other nation may do the same thing with regard to American contracts. The theory of the La Follette law leads directly to reprisals and to anarchy in international trade. The Wisconsin Senator would repeal all our treaties of commerce and abolish the consular system resting on them in a vain and absurd effort to benefit an international seamen's body of which only a very few American citizens are members.

President Wilson apparently signed this fantastic bill without grasping its meaning. His subordinates are now endeavoring to construe it into innocuousness. But the courts do not favor such juggling. The only proper way to get rid of this vicious law is to repeal it. President Wilson owes it to the country to ask Con-

gress to recall this act, which is violative of international good faith, discriminative as between nations engaged in commerce with us and especially oppressive to our shipping, which is already, in desperation, abandoning our flag and seeking fairer treatment under the flags of our maritime rivals.

## An Airing for "The Island."

If Commissioner Davis is right in saying that Tannenbaum's tale of the Blackwell's Island horrors is overdrawn and colored by personal bias no harm will result from the proposed official inquiry into conditions there. If, on the other hand, his charges are nearer the truth than the Commissioner believes, distinct good should result from an airing.

Many charges have been made against institutions under Miss Davis's supervision; some of them she has answered to the entire satisfaction of the public; some she has dismissed in a manner which has seemed distinctly cavalier—and the public has been left with the choice of taking her word or the word of her opponents, but with no means of forming its own judgment on independent investigation or testimony. It might clear the air and be beneficial for her and her department if in this case the public had opportunity to be present at a showdown.

## Remote Victims of the War.

What's the use of living 100 miles within the Arctic Circle if the temperate zone with its temperate passions regulates one's welfare? The Esquimaux of Point Hope and its suburbs, in Alaska, are nursing some such subconscious query. The war and a trade monopoly have combined among other things to threaten them with starvation, and the German Kaiser has joined their regiment of devils.

They do not blame the Kaiser for the monopoly, however. That was brought about by an act of God (the Esquimaux still keep the two distinct in their minds). Orin Rank, who ran a store at the Point, was drowned last year and the supplies for his store were lost, which left Captain Backlund the sole merchant of the community.

Now, the captain is not wintering at Point Hope for his health. He is a "bad trust." When, on a trip to Kotzebue last fall, he learned that the war was going on, he sent orders, so the Rev. A. R. Hoare, an Episcopal missionary, writes, "that not more than \$3.50 was to be paid for fox skins, instead of \$12, \$14 and \$15 that had been paid previously, and at the same time he raised the prices of all food in stock; flour, \$6 instead of \$5; sugar, \$14 a hundred instead of \$10, and so on."

A whole chapter of troubles had preceded this. The whaling industry had collapsed; the seal hunt was a failure, and only a hundred foxes were taken, as against five hundred the year before. So that not only have the Esquimaux been deprived of white man's food, but of their native provender as well. Of all the people of the earth they, apparently, were the least prepared for the war.

Bishop Ewe has written to the editor of "The Living Church" soliciting aid for these poor, innocent, remote folk. Mr. Hoare and his assistant, Mr. Rogers, are going into debt to supply from a soup kitchen a square meal once a day to 100 of them and twice a week to 250. Through Captain Backlund, as a middleman of trouble, the sufferings of these children of the North are not measurably less than those of the Belgians. Let the hearts that have opened for the Belgians find room for the Esquimaux of Point Hope.

The decision of the administration not to allow naval officers to resign will undoubtedly be held by some as an endorsement of Secretary Daniels's contention that conditions in the navy have become almost ideal under his rectorial and paternalistic management.

An individual who has been widely known as "Becker's press agent" is alleged to have said that he first met the condemned man in a prison. Any statements about Becker's innocence from such a source seem self-discredited.

Saville has been placing too free an emphasis on its first syllable.

Dollar ships seem to have gone with "dollar" diplomacy.

## A Story of Buelow.

Prince Buelow, whom the Kaiser sent to Rome on what has proved to be a disastrous special mission, has a fund of anecdotes, and has been heard to tell this amusing story, in which the "all-highness" plays a leading part. Some years ago, when he was retiring from the ambassadorship at Rome to take up the post of Chancellor of the Empire, he summoned his cook, a veritable cordon bleu, to tell him of the change. "I shall not be in our present grand style," he said, "but in a much smaller scale. Perhaps, therefore, you would prefer to find another place." The cook, doubtless imagining that financial disaster was impending, remained silent for a few moments, then with the air of one about to perform a sympathetic act replied, "Well, Excellency, I am grieved at hearing such melancholy news, but I shall remain in your service. Whatever may happen to you, I would not for worlds have it said I had deserted you in your time of misery!" One evening the Prince told the story to the Kaiser, who had had personal experience of the culinary chef's skill, and was highly amused at the Prince's anecdote. So interested, indeed, did the Emperor feel in the cook that shortly afterward he sent the worthy fellow a handsome gold watch, on the lid of which was engraved the one word "Miser!" by which name his majesty ever afterward laughingly spoke of and addressed him.

## The Iron Crown of Italy.

Nobody has noticed the curious coincidence that Italy declared war on the same day of May that Napoleon in 1805 was crowned King of Italy at Milan, and with his own hands placed the ancient iron crown of Lombardy on his head. This most famous crown of Europe is so called from a narrow band of iron "miraculously" preserved from rust, and which, in the inner circumference of the crown, is composed of jewels and emblems of gold, the workmanship of which bears strange resemblance to that on the enameled gold ornament belonging to King Alfred which was found in Somerset, and is now preserved in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford.

## THE WAY TO PEACE

## Let Germany Do Something to End Hostilities.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May I be permitted through your columns to offer a suggestion to Mr. Ridder, Mr. Bryan, the "American Women for Strict Neutrality" and their friends, who are so eager for our neutrality and for an immediate cessation of war?

How often must it be reiterated that with no violation of neutrality and in accordance with international law we have a perfect right as individuals to sell arms and ammunition to warring nations or contractors? And as it is said that less than 1 per cent of the supplies used by the Allies goes from the United States, why should not these misguided people devote their energies to a field where something might really be accomplished?

Instead of promoting sedition and anarchy in this country, let these professed peace lovers urge the Kaiser at once to withdraw his armies from France, from Russia, from little Belgium. If he does this without being compelled, no doubt other matters could be amicably arranged.

Or did Belgium begin the war by invading Germany and shall we rather, refusing ammunition to the brave King fighting in the far corner of his country, leave him and his people to the tender mercies of the enemy, his country blotted out?

For liberty, for democratic government, for the existence of other nations these peace lovers seem to have no care. German imperialism, German domination of Europe, is the obvious desire of the many, while a few genuine but short sighted pacifists would promote a temporary and unjust peace, pregnant with the seeds of future strife, with still greater horrors in store.

And not alone German domination in Europe! If victors we may expect them at our shores, exacting enormous indemnities if we would save our coast cities from destruction. Then our dear German-Americans, who loudly profess neutrality, would, I doubt not, flock in great numbers to the German standard, with a resulting civil war by the side of which the last would be child's play; no sectional strife, but traitors in every city.

Impossible? Nothing is impossible with the Germans victors in the present contest. And who would help us with fleet or army after our present correct and strict neutrality? Let the German-Americans go home and help their friends or cease to promote sedition, and let the real Americans preserve a proper neutrality, or, instead of selfishly thanking God that we are out of the war, let them go to the aid of those who fight the battles of liberty and self-government and not for world domination. The most and the ablest of the true peace lovers desire not a hasty and temporary peace, but that this war, fought to a just conclusion, shall be the last.

ANNIE S. PECK.

New York, July 8, 1915.

## Prophets and Flower Pots.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish very much for information regarding the intense persecution of clairvoyants, palm readers, crystal readers, etc.

What harm do they do? To my certain knowledge they often do good. My life was once saved by the timely warning regarding a train I intended taking. I postponed my journey; the train met with an accident in which two persons lost their lives and a number were injured.

It is true that in this case the advice cost me nothing, as it came from a friend—an old lady who never used "the gift" in a professional way—that is, for money, but it would have been for me money well spent if it had cost a good fee.

I could cite a considerable number of instances in which most valuable advice has been given—sometimes life saved, at others loss of money averted.

How fortunate for Elijah, Elijah, Jeremiah, Isaiah and others to whom we accord honor because we view them through the vista of time that they are safe now in the Promised Land!

Instead of employing detectives to run down palm readers (by the bye, the Bible says "God hath placed signs in the hands of men"), why not employ them to inspect apartment and other dwelling houses where large flower pots stand, in a majority of cases absolutely unprotected, and occasionally falling? I asked a policeman to order the safeguarding or removal of a huge jardiniere from the window sill of a handsome apartment house where it stood without safeguard, but he declined, because, he said, "it wasn't any of his business." Oh! well, this is a free country!

While so many vital matters need attention would it not be more useful and dignified to spend money and time to some better purpose than the persecution of prophets?

New York, July 7, 1915. C. B. M.

## Majorities and Votes.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Under the headline "Minority Rule" Helen Kent says in substance that the majority of women do not want to vote and also that the majority should rule. There seem to be many who have these mistaken views. The majority of women do want to vote, as is proved by the fact that in every country and twelve states and one territory of this country, where the women are at liberty to vote or not, as they choose, a majority of women vote. Besides, if the privilege of women to vote in any of these places were found objectionable to a majority, the majority would have to vote only once to repeal the law and that would settle it.

The right of the majority to rule is determined by voting, but the right to vote exists regardless of whether anybody wants it or not. In the special election held a year ago last April, only 16 per cent of the men entitled to vote. Did the fact that the majority did not want to vote disfranchise the men?

The right of women to vote is just the same as the right of men, because they are affected by the vote the same as the men are. Our constitution withholds the privilege from half of the people and places us in that ridiculous position that a majority of one-half of the people have the power of keeping the other half from voting. But neither majority nor minority can force any woman or man to vote if she or he is too busy or too lazy.

New York, July 6, 1915. G. M. B.

## We Hope to Continue.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Reading the daily papers has become so automatic nowadays that it takes something more than an "extra" to excite the blade reader, who has long since lost that avid sense for news that the war a year ago aroused. It is now in such writing as is exemplified by your editorials in this morning's Tribune—"German Experiments" and "Secret Plans"—that we readers feel that our interest in the printed word is honestly maintained. So long as you continue to keep the same vivid interest in the real issues before the country and the people you may be sure that I shall continue to be "YOUR READER."

New York, July 8, 1915.

## NEUTRALITY LEAGUE POSTERS

## A Demand That Women Generally Disavow Them.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Being in enthusiastic agreement with the women of this city who have already taken steps to insure the removal of those prime disseminators of malicious misstatements, the huge signboards put up by the Women's Neutrality League, of Baltimore, I desire through your columns to ask a question which seems to me to be pertinent to the occasion.

Next November the men of this state are to vote on the equal suffrage amendment to the constitution. What stand are suffrage and anti-suffrage organizations going to take on the women's movement mentioned above? It seems to me that these organizations must come out flat-footedly either for or against. If their verdict is one of approval of this dastardly outrage perpetrated by a few hysterical women they can only be branded as either mental incompetents or as traitors. If they continue their silence, it must be that they are cowards. The women of America have never given cause for their designation by either stigma, and it seems impossible that the day has come when they will willingly forfeit their good name. The men of this state are now waiting, and on the answer the women give now will depend in no small degree the answer the men will give next fall.

The feminine leaders of this pro-German movement situated in Baltimore and in Brooklyn have been far from ready to inform the misled signers of their petition of the true state of affairs. It is probably safe to say that ninety-nine of the names on the aforesaid petition are placed there by their owners in utter ignorance of the result of their misguided enthusiasm, were the petition to be a success. The question to ask is not "Do you want peace at any price?" but "Do you desire to deliberately choose the cause of the Allies to death and insure victory for Germany?"

As for American merchants being unwilling to sell arms to Germany, I can say of my own knowledge that this is an utter falsehood, and I am in a position to know what I am talking about. It is women who have started this controversy and who are carrying it on, and unless the great mass of women are willing to step forward openly and at once to show their true colors in this contingency it will simply result in the innocent bearing the burdens of the guilty. EDWARD HALE BIERSTADT.

New York, July 6, 1915.

## Germany's Self-Preservation.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have read with great interest your editorial of July 6, "July Prospects. I."

I must admit it was written in a clear, convincing and brilliant style. However, I do not agree with your assertion that Germany has been successful so far in fighting all her foes individually, but as soon as the Allies start their concerted offensive Germany will be defeated. Here you seem to ignore the most momentous fact. It is not alone their great generals, their superior strategy and their efficient organization that make the Germans fight as no other nation in history has fought before; it is their realization of self-preservation—the first law of nature—and hence their wonderful spirit, that makes Germany unconquerable.

PINCHOS VON BERZEWITZ.

Highland Falls, N. Y., June 27, 1915.

## German Soldiers Not Huns.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I read with profound indignation editorials as well as letters submitted by readers of the American press calling the Germans "Huns." I think if soldiers throw away their sense of self-preservation to sacrifice themselves for the benefit of their country and family, such "Huns" ought to be praised and not insulted by people who fight battles with the pen, without running any risk. The Russians, who are 90 per cent analphabets, have never been called Huns. They who are handicapped by an inferior intellectual and ethical training are more apt to commit atrocities than the Germans. Did the neutral English press raise any protest? No! And Americans claim to stand for fair play.

I challenge every reader of this or any

## A PLACE IN THE SUN.



## AN ARBITER OF DESTINIES

## Colonel Roosevelt Should Exhume Himself for Country's Good.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In a communication published in The Tribune on November 4, 1914, under the caption "Colonel Roosevelt's Place," is the following statement:

"Mr. Roosevelt's selfish ambition brought the country to the verge of a cataclysm. Mr. Roosevelt should not be altogether eliminated from the confidence of the people; he should learn the truth that the more faithful are the services of a statesman to his countrymen, accompanied by an utter abnegation of self, the more real is his patriotism, and he will earn and receive the confidence and applause of his fellow citizens. Mr. Roosevelt's place is in the Republican party."

The country needs the moral tonic of having Mr. Roosevelt in his accustomed place in the Republican party, with his positive and unyielding leadership. The "big stick" should come to the fore. Mr. Roosevelt should not sulk in his tent like some disgruntled Arab. It is not consistent with the Rooseveltian energy.

The people, regardless of partisan affiliations, would heartily welcome the Colonel's return to his party, and the people would hail his return as that of a prodigal who has come to himself. This return of the Colonel to reason would make him a great arbiter of the destinies of our country at this crucial period.

ALBERT SAMUEL VOGAN.

New York, July 8, 1915.

## Ford for President.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It seems quite evident that the United States is suffering from blundering government.

Having enormous crops and sale for most of them at high prices and general conditions wonderfully in our favor, and with no apparent reason, except lack of good judgment in administration, we are suffering from prostration of industries. Workmen are unemployed, investments are unprofitable and there is a frequent cry of hard times.

If it were not for the war, which brings us orders for instruments of murder and food for the contending nations, our distress would be much greater than it is.

It would seem that capable and successful business men who have been able to manage large affairs should be placed at the head of our government, with the hope that instead of suing and trying to break up the concerns which are trying to promote the prosperity of our country they will so control and regulate them that we, as well as they, may profit largely.

There is one man who seems to me particularly fitted to undertake the task. I do not know what his political affiliations are and it is not necessary to inquire. So far as I know, he has almost no enemies, and if nominated nearly every workman and every capitalist would be likely to vote for him. I hope he will be the nominee of both parties. I have not the pleasure of his acquaintance, but hope he will pardon me for presenting him for nomination for our next President.

His name is Henry Ford. H. H. SWIFT.

Millbrook, N. Y., July 7, 1915.

## War Declaration.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Will you kindly publish in your paper the date that Germany declared war on England, and also the date England declared war on Germany.

WILLIAM MADDIE.

New York, July 7, 1915.

[In answer to the British ultimatum that she withdraw her troops from Belgium and Luxembourg, Germany, said on August 4, 1914, "A state of war exists." Great Britain followed the same evening with a declaration of war against Germany.—Ed.]

## Defence of Miss Rowe.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am much moved to learn that a war of words has been progressing concerning a meeting held on June 23 at Freeport, Long Island, in the interests of the organization to which I have the honor to belong.

The purpose of the meeting was not to debate with the suffragists nor to provoke them into a controversy, but to enlighten a community we thought needed enlightenment as to the position held by the majority of the women in this state on the subject of woman suffrage.

At this meeting plainclothes men were present, not at our request, but at the request of certain citizens who anticipated trouble for our side.

The speaker was not allowed to proceed without interruptions, and since the meeting the suffragists have not ceased to express their indignation at the things which were said by Miss Rowe, whom they have roundly abused in the public press.

One of the principles of the organization opposed to woman suffrage is to avoid personalities. Miss Rowe has been speaking under my immediate direction this winter, and I have never known her to transgress in this respect. She has my fullest confidence and is considered by the men who have heard her to be one of our most effective speakers.

We are not responsible for the hysteria produced which caused the hearers to consider as personally offensive remarks of a general character, which if reported verbatim would be seen to be humorously inoffensive.

MRS. GEORGE PHILLIPS.

Secretary New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Brooklyn, July 8, 1915.

## A Parallel.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your issue of to-day announces the conversion of one William Jennings Bryan to universal suffrage. The report furnishes an argument given by the Peerless One from the intellectual and moral standpoint. Here it is: "Let me give you an argument for those who question the morality and intelligence of giving the ballot to women. More than 90 per cent of the inmates of the Nebraska penitentiary are men."

Mr. Bryan is a religious man. Does he know that over 90 per cent of the inmates of the penitentiaries are religious? Applying his argument to the religious question, does it not place him on the wrong side of the fence? Should he not declare himself in favor of free thought? That is where his own argument logically places him.

New York, July 8, 1915. W. C. F.

## Lemberg and the Russians.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Will you kindly inform me why the Russians, when they were in Lemberg, did not exact some enormous indemnity from that city? Your paper gave an account recently of a levy and fine on some city in France occupied by the Germans, who stated it was owing to the fact that the Allies' aerial craft dropped bombs on Constantinople. Are the Russians more considerate or lacking in the mercenary methods of their foes for not exacting a similar indemnity from Lemberg and claim as justification that their enemy used poisonous gases? It is generally reported that places evacuated by the Teutons are in ruin or completely destroyed, but your paper states that Lemberg was not damaged by the Russians. EIMO PELL.

Bronxville, N. Y., July 4, 1915.

## A "Doubted Suicide."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: How did Holt meet his death? This